

REMARKS

The present application was filed on June 24, 2003 with claims 1 through 21. Claims 1 through 21 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 14 and 17 are proposed to be amended herein and claims 11-13 are proposed to be cancelled herein, without prejudice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5, 10, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Metze (United States Patent No. 5,754,948). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 3, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze in view of Cheung et al. (United States Patent No. 6,577,157). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze in view of Nozawa et al. (United States Patent No. 6,942,157). Claims 6 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze. Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metze in view of Ghaem (United States Patent No. 5,335,361).

Independent Claims 1, 14 and 17

Independent claims 1, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Metze. The Examiner asserts that Metze teaches a method for wireless communication among first and second integrated circuit devices 16 within an enclosure 12, said method comprising the steps of: transmitting a signal using a first antenna associated with said first integrated circuit device (citing antenna in FIG. 2); and receiving said signal using a second antenna associated with said second integrated circuit device within said enclosure 12.

Each of the independent claims 1, 14 and 17 have been amended to emphasize that the signal is transmitted using the first antenna *in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard*. The Examiner has previously considered this limitation with regard to original claim 12. With regard to claim 12, the Examiner acknowledged that Metze failed to teach that the signal is transmitted in accordance with an ultra wide band standard. The Examiner asserts, however, that it would be obvious to include different short-range standards into the system of Metze.

Metze is clearly limited to transmission and reception over *discrete* carrier frequencies. See, for example, the discussion at col. 4, lines 48-53, where it is noted that if the

MIMIC 16 labeled T1/R1 (in FIG. 1) transmits at (discrete) frequency f2 and receives at (discrete) frequency f1 and the MIMIC 16 labeled T2/R2 transmits at (discrete) frequency f1 and receives at (discrete) frequency f2, data can be readily transmitted between the CPUs 14 labeled A1 and A2.

Ultra wide band communications, on the other hand, is a *wideband* wireless technology, rather than a *narrowband* technology, that depends on encoding the information on a number of narrow carrier frequencies. Using multiple frequency bands, the transmitted information is effectively spread across a wide range of frequencies. See, e.g., http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ultra_wideband.

Thus, Metze the use of *discrete* carrier frequencies, such as f1 and f2, for transmission and reception between two integrated circuits *teaches away* from the present invention, as claimed by each independent claim, as amended.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 14 and 17.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-10, 15-16, and 18-21 are dependent on independent claims 1, 14 and 17, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Metze, Cheung et al., Nozawa et al. and Ghaem, alone or in any combination, because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 14 and 17 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-10 and 14-21, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin M. Mason
Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

Date: July 14, 2006